



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/701,463	05/02/2001	Michael J Tisdale	PM 275915	9962

909 7590 10/21/2003
PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP
P.O. BOX 10500
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

SNEDDEN, SHERIDAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1653

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2003

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/701,463

Applicant(s)

TISDALE ET AL.

Examiner

Sheridan K Snedden

Art Unit

1653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 31-45 and 47-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 31-45 and 47-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is in response to Paper #15, filed 12 August 2003. Claims 1-30 and 46 have been canceled. Applicant's amendment of claims 31-45, 47 is acknowledged. Claims 31-45 and 47-49 are under examination.

Withdrawal of Objections and Rejections

2. The objections and/or rejections not explicitly restated or stated below are withdrawn.

Maintained Objections and Rejections

Drawings

3. This application has been filed with informal drawings that are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 31-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The invention is directed to a lipid mobilizing factor (LMF) and method of making LMF and method of using LMF. LMF is described in the specification as possessing the physiochemical properties of Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein. However, the specification fails to teach how to distinguish LMF from Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein, and thereof fails to teach how to make and use a LMF different from Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein. For example, on page 5, lines 10-15, the LMF is described as Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein or are very close analogues and may be referred to as glycoproteins of the Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein type. Page 3, lines 25-26, the specification teaches that the composition of human Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein can vary somewhat when isolated from different fluids or tissues. Page 28, teaches that antibody raised to Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein was capable of detecting the LMF of the instant invention. In this manner, the specification describes the LMF in a way that would suggest that LMF is Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein and that the two are one in the same. A LMF other than Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein, and variants of Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein known in the prior art, is not taught.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19USPQ2d 1111, clearly states that “applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of *the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the ‘written description’ inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*.” (See page 1117.) The specification does not “clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed.” (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116).

With the exception of SEQ ID NO: 1 and Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein itself, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed LMF, or variants and fragments which would possess the lipolytic activity, and therefore conception is not achieved.

Art Unit: 1653

until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See *Fiddes v. Baird*, 30 USPQ2d 1481 at 1483. In *Fiddes*, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found to be unpatentable due to lack of written description for that broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

Therefore, only isolated proteins comprising the amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NOs: 1 & 2, but not the full breadth of the claim, meets the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 1115).

The applicant argues that the specification teaches the isolation of LMF from MAC16 cells and cachectic patients. The applicant has not fully addressed the above rejection. The crux of the written description rejection above is that the compound described has not been claimed in a manner to distinguish the product from Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein. It is asserted that the product presently described and claimed in the instant application is Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein. No other such glycoprotein is described in the prior art and it has been taught that Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein may physically vary when isolated from different body fluids or tissues (see Ohkubo *et al.*). In addition, the active variants and fragments of the product have not been described. With the exception of SEQ ID NO: 1 and Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein itself, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structure of the encompassed LMF, or variants and fragments which would possess the lysoytic activity.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 32, 33 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. The term "substantially" in claims 32, 35 and 39 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "substantially" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Applicant arguments expressing the contrary opinion to the above are not persuasive because the response does not point to any part of the specification that defines the term as argued in the response or as presented in the claim.

7. Claims 33 indefinite as they depend from the above claims and do not clarify the ambiguity.

8. Claim 32 is indefinite as the claim recites a protein having homology to the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 1 but fails to provide a sequence for comparison. The term "homology" would be a relative term. The term "homology" is not defined by the claim and the

Art Unit: 1653

specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Applicant arguments (Response at pages 8-9) expressing the contrary opinion to the above are not persuasive because the response does not point to any part of the specification that defines the term as argued in the response or as presented in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 31-43 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Araki *et al.* (Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1988 Feb; 85(3):679-83). Araki *et al.* teach Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein that shares a 100% homology of with SEQ ID NO: 1 of the instant application(see figure 1). Araki *et al.* teach Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein shows a molecular mass of about 39 kDa or about 43 kDa as is recited in the claims. Claims 31-43 are directed to a lipid-mobilizing agent that has the characteristics of Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein and the claims recite inherent characteristics of Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein as limitations. Specifically, the claims recite the limitation of molecular mass or greater than 6 kD or about 43 kD, lipolytic activity, homology of SEQ ID NO: 1 or of a Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein, activity of stimulating adenylate cyclase activity, and immunological properties (regarding claims 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 38, and 39). Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein is a lipid mobilizing factor

Art Unit: 1653

that has the same electrophoresis mobility, immunoreactivity and ability to stimulate lipolysis and adenylate cyclase activity as Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein. In effect, the lipid mobilizing factor recited in the above claims is Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein as described in Araki *et al.* and the limitations of claims 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 38, and 39 are directed to inherent properties of Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein.

In addition, Araki *et al.* teach the enzymatic digestion of Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein with trypsin, chymotrypsin and pyroglutamate aminopeptidase which would possess the inherent activity or inactivity as described in claims 37, 40, 41 and 43. Araki *et al.* also teaches the purification of Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein, which would be "substantially" free of proteolytic activity (regarding claim 42). The ability of periodate treatment to destroy the lipid mobilizing activity is inherent to Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein. Thus, the reference anticipates the claimed invention.

Applicant argues that the reference does not teach the product by the process of the claims; and that the reference does not teach a pharmaceutical composition. The rejection does not include the method of treatment as stated by applicant. These arguments are considered but not found to be persuasive. Applicant is reminded that it is the product itself that is under consideration for patentability. As such, the product of the above reference is the same even though it was isolated by a different process. Additionally, the pharmaceutical composition is not claimed to contain anything other than a polypeptide with the properties of Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein. Thus, the reference anticipated the invention.

11. Claims 31-43 and 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohkubo *et al.* (Prep Biochem. 1988;18(4):413-30.). Ohkubo *et al.* teach Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein that

Art Unit: 1653

would shares a homology with SEQ ID NO: 1 of the instant application and would have the physiochemical properties of a Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein. Ohkubo *et al.* teach Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein shows a molecular mass of about 43 kDa as shown in figure 2 (See also page 419). Ohkubo *et al.* teach a 6 step purification process that resulted in purified Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein in 20mM Tris-HCl buffer, a pharmaceutically acceptable formulation for injection (see page 419, column 2; regarding claims 46 and 47). Claims 31-43 are directed to a lipid-mobilizing agent that has the characteristics of Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein and the claims recite inherent characteristics of Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein as limitations. Specifically, the claims recite the limitation of molecular mass or greater than 6 kD or about 43 kD, lipolytic activity, homology of SEQ ID NO: 1 or of a Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein, activity of stimulating adenylate cyclase activity, and immunological properties (regarding claims 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 38, and 39). Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein is a lipid mobilizing factor that has the same electrophoresis mobility, immunoreactivity and ability to stimulate lipolysis and adenylate cyclase activity as Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein. In effect, the lipid mobilizing factor recite in the above claims is Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein as described in Ohkubo *et al.* and the limitations of claims 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 38, and 39 are directed to inherent properties of Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein.

Applicant argues that the reference does not teach the product by the process of the claims; and that the reference does not teach a pharmaceutical composition. The rejection does not include the method of treatment as stated by applicant. These arguments are considered but not found to be persuasive. Applicant is reminded that it is the product itself that is under consideration for patentability. As such, the product of the above reference is the same even though it was isolated by a different process. Additionally, the pharmaceutical composition is

Art Unit: 1653

not claimed to contain anything other than a polypeptide with the properties of Zn- α^2 -glycoprotein. Thus, the reference anticipated the invention.

Conclusion

12. No claims are allowed

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sheridan K Snedden whose telephone number is (703) 305-4843. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Low can be reached on (703) 308-2923. The fax phone number for regular communications to the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-3975.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

SKS
October 20, 2003

SKS

Christopher S. F. Low

CHRISTOPHER S. F. LOW
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1800